



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,631

10/30/2003

Javier Saenz

IGT1P419BX1/AP00014-010

3077

79646

7590

12/07/2009

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT

Attn: IGT

P.O. Box 70250

Oakland, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

LE, KHANH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3688

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/07/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/699,631	Applicant(s) SAENZ, JAVIER	
	Examiner KHANH H. LE	Art Unit 3688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 31, 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 31, 2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the correspondence filed 07/31/09. Claims 1-9 and 21-29 were and remain in the application. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

Claim objections

2. Previous objections to Claims 21-27: withdrawn following proper amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. Previous rejections of Claims 1-9 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter are withdrawn following proper amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, and 21- 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boushy et al. US 6003013 in view of Pierce US 6332126 and Walker 20030027635.

Independent claims 1, 21 and dependent claims 8, 9, and 28:

BOUSHY discloses:

A computer-implemented method and system for selecting awards to be offered to patrons of an establishment (abstract), the method comprising:

maintaining a **patron database** storing patron information relating to a plurality of patrons and historical transaction information involving said patrons (abstract; col. 9 lines 52-67; Fig 3 item 212;) connected to a **central server unit** (fig. 1 items 112 , 114 and associated text: database server; marketing server; Fig 2A: components of server 112) with **a processor and a memory** (inherent)

monitoring substantially current transaction activity of said plurality of patrons (abstract: updated customer accounts; Figures 3 and 4 and associated text) and storing in **current activity database**;

regularly assigning a profile (i.e. assigning then updating the profile) to said first patron (col. 5 lines 21-24; col. 10 lines 54-61), by a profile assignment module executable by said server processor, based at least upon portions of said historical transaction information pertinent to said first patron and said substantially real time or current transaction activity (abstract; col. 9 lines 52-67; also col. 9 line 67 to col. 10 line 2);

by an award matching module executable by said server processor, matching 2 or more awards to ones of said profiles (abstract, last line); and

offering said one or more awards to ones of said plurality of patrons assigned to said ones of said profiles (abstract, last line; Figure 4; Fig. 4 item 454 and associated text).

(Note: Boushy also discloses

generating and receiving a script containing information relating to conveyance of awards (e.g. col. 12 lines 8-12: the number of points, based on an newly determined status, is determined ; this information about the points to be offered to customer is the script);

BOUSHY further discloses wherein said historical transaction information is reflective of prior participation of said plurality of patrons in gaming activity managed by said business establishment (abstract) and (claim 20) wherein said profile is selected as a function of participation of said first patron in said gaming activity and in current gaming activity (abstract: updated profile; col. 9 lines 55-67).

Boushy discloses several offers based on updated profiles but **does not specifically disclose** “based upon at least the historical transaction information involving said patrons including the first patron and the current transaction activity of at least the first patron, sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting each award; and outputting, based upon said sorting, at least one recommendation of an award to offer to the first patron.”

However Pierce, in the same computer-based targeted discount and incentives art, **discloses consumer transaction histories used to match qualified consumers to targeted merchant discount offers.** Offers are automatically prioritized based on their expected value to consumers and consumers receive the highest priority offers for which they qualify. (abstract; col. 2 lines 34-37). **The default prioritization can be altered or overridden by the merchants system (abstract).** Pierce also discloses, after matching offers to consumers, automatically notifying them of the best offers for which they qualify (col. 4 lines

Art Unit: 3688

55-57; Figure 1.8). In doing so, Pierce discloses the goal is to offer patrons the offers in which they will be most interested (Pierce, col. 2 lines 18-24).

The offers prioritizing in Pierce reads on offers sorting as claimed, (i.e. in order of importance, see definition per [http:// dictionary.reference.com/browse/prioritize](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/prioritize), printout provided with the last Office Action). Since Pierce teaches patrons will be most interested in these offers, Peirce thus discloses "sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting each award" as claimed because logically patrons would be likely to accept what they are "most interested" in.

Thus it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made (herein a "PHOSITA") to add the above Peirce's teaching of prioritizing offers to Boushy to offer patrons the best offers in which they will be most interested (Pierce, col. 2 lines 18-24).

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE does not explicitly disclose recommendations. However Pierce's notifying of the best prioritized offers reads on recommendations. This is because the system or system operators can override the default prioritization (see abstract), thus this prioritized list only acts as a list of suggestions or recommendations of offers to present to the consumer. The motivation to add this limitation of Pierce to Boushy is to allow some degree of flexibility to the system operator in making the offers.

Further it would have been obvious to combine the recommendations of Peirce to Boushy since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements (recommendations of offers of Pierce and offers made in Boushy), and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately (i.e. the offers would just have been recommended instead of being imposed), and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

(Response to Arguments:

Applicants argue: *"Applicant believes that the Office Communication's interpretation of Pierce are not consistent with the methods in Pierce described with respect to Figures 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9. The claims recite "based upon at least the historical transaction information involving said patrons including the first patron and the current transaction activity of at least the first patron, sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting each award." Pierce teaches in Col. 12:52-56, that "When a participating merchant makes a sale to qualifying cardholder who has received the merchants discount offer, the cardholder will receive the discount as an automatic credit without any further action (beyond normal credit sales processing) on behalf of either the merchant or the cardholder." **Pierce does not teach the first patron has an opportunity to accept or reject each award.** In Pierce, if a player qualifies for an award they receive it whether they want it or not, the cardholder has no say. If the cardholder has no say, Applicant asks what would be the point in Pierce of "sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting each award" when the player never is afforded an opportunity to accept or reject an offer.*

In response, the Examiner notes that claim 1 claims in part:

*"matching, using said award matching module, two or more awards to said profile;
based upon at least the historical transaction information involving said patrons
including the first patron and the current transaction activity of at least the first patron,
sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting
each award; and
**displaying a second interface on the display device, based upon said sorting,
information regarding at least one recommendation of an award to offer to the first
patron wherein access to said first interface and said second interface is limited to
operators of said gaming establishment."***

Independent claim 21 and claims 8,9, 28 have similar language.

Art Unit: 3688

Thus the claims are displaying to gaming operators at least one recommendation of an award to offer to patrons. It is not claimed, as argued, that the first patron has an opportunity to accept or reject each award. It is also not claimed the player has any say as argued. Further, contrary to argument, implicitly the Pierce consumer has a say in accepting or rejecting the offer (s) received. The Pierce col.12 lines 52-56 cited by Applicants shows a consumer effectively accepting the offer by making a purchase that involves the discount offer. Only then are the rewards automatically implemented without further consumer action.)

End of Response to Arguments.

Boushy and Pierce does not disclose:

a **hand-held display device** the use of which is limited to operators of the gaming establishment

with first interface and said second interface on the display device,

wherein said first interface comprises a visual indicator to display a location of a first patron rendered on the floor diagram of said gaming establishment

wherein said second interface displays, based upon results of said sort, information indicating at least one recommendation of a first award from the matched awards to offer to ones said first patron

and data for generating a floor diagram of the gaming establishment including a relative position and an arrangement of gaming devices and gaming tables within the gaming establishment.

However Walker, in the same gaming and offers arts, discloses:

a hand-held display device the use of which is limited to operators of the gaming establishment (e.g. Figure 1 item 140: representative device; Fig 5 item 570; 580; [0046]; [0076])

with first interface and said second interface on the display device,

wherein said first interface comprises a visual indicator to display a location of a first patron rendered on the **floor diagram** of said gaming establishment ([0186]: map of casino on rep device);

wherein said second interface displays, information indicating at least one recommendation of a first award from the matched awards to offer to ones said first patron ([0114] last 4 lines) the server provides list of offers matched to particular players, subject to override by representative);

and server generating data for generating a floor diagram of the gaming establishment including a relative position and an arrangement of gaming devices and gaming tables within the gaming establishment (inherent in order to generate the map shown to the representative device, see paragraph [0186]).

Thus it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to add the representative device of Walker to Boushy and Pierce to provide another convenient method of displaying offers to patrons, by mobile service attendants, as taught by Walker. In this case, it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA that the sorted and matched offers or recommendations as taught by Walker and Pierce would also have been displayed. *(Note that Walker also teaches (at [0114] last 4 lines) the server provides list of offers matched to particular players, subject to override by representative. Since the representative is on the floor and can observe the player before making the offer, see e.g. [0076], her selection of which offer reads on sorting the list of matched suggestions according to a likelihood of acceptance. Since Walker teaches displaying the manual sort on the device, while Pierce teaches sorting automatically, it would have been obvious, in the*

Art Unit: 3688

system of Boushy, Pierce and Walker, to display the automatic sort on the Walker's device). It would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to add the mapping functionality of the representative device of Walker and its necessary mapping data generation to Boushy and Pierce so to provide the useful customer location function as taught by Walker.

(Note: Walker also discloses:

A computer-implemented patron award system for a gaming establishment comprising:

- a) a patron database (e.g. Figure 4 item 455 and associated text; Figure item 580 "likes to play golf" reads on patron characteristics or profiles; e.g. [0159]);
in which is maintained patron information relating to a plurality of patrons and historical transaction information (e.g. Figure 5 item 580 "staying at hotel") involving said patrons;
- b) a current activity database for storing substantially current transaction activity information (e.g. Figure item 580 "last 10 spins have been losing outcomes ") for said plurality of patrons;
- c) a server unit operatively connected to said patron database and said current activity database, said central server including:

- a processor and a memory associated with said processor,
wherein said memory further includes:

- a profile assignment module executable by said processor, said profile assignment module being disposed to regularly assign (i.e. update) profiles to said plurality of patrons (e.g. Figure 4 item 455 and associated text; Figure item 580 "likes to play golf" reads on patron characteristics or profiles; e.g. [0159]);[0048]: representative can view

Art Unit: 3688

player's profiles (e.g. "hobbies") and update player's profiles via her PDA, e.g. as to acceptance of offers;

an award matching module executable by said processor, said award matching module operating to match awards to ones of said profiles ([0114] last 4 lines: server provides list of offers matched to particular players, subject to override by representative);

logic executed by the processor designed or configured to,

based upon at least the historical transaction information related to the plurality of patrons and said substantially current transaction activity of said plurality of patrons, provide the matched awards to a first patron (of said plurality of patrons assigned to said ones of said profiles) (e.g. [0092]); and display on mobile representative device with 1st and 2nd interface as discussed above).

Claims 2, 22-23:

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claims 1, or 21 above and BOUSHY further discloses defining a plurality of profiles associated with a corresponding plurality of profile valuations, said assigning further including selecting said profile from said plurality of profiles.
(col. 9 lines 52-67: e.g. VIP customers).

Claims 3, 24, 26:

Art Unit: 3688

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claims 1, or 21 above and BOUSHY further discloses defining a plurality of awards, said matching further including selecting said award from said plurality of awards based upon a profile valuation of said profile and a value of said award (abstract: distinguished (i.e. more valuable) services for special status (i.e. is higher valuation) customers; col. 12 lines 8-12, 20-22: different levels of points; col. 12 lines 50-55: different levels of comps).

Claims 4, 25:

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claims 1, or 24 above and BOUSHY further discloses wherein said profile is characterized by a profile valuation (col. 9 line 2 to col. 10 line 2 : VIP or Premier customers profiles, “worth to the casino” or “theoretical win value” read on profile valuations). Boushy also discloses awards commensurate with customers’ expenditures and her worth to the casino (e.g. based on her “theoretical win value” to the casino) (col. 14 lines 9-25).

However BOUSHY does not specifically disclose said award matched to said profile is being valued at less than or equivalent to said profile valuation.

However, businesses are not in the business to lose money. Since giving awards values higher than what the business can make of the customer (e.g. based on her “theoretical win value” to the casino) is losing money, it would have been obvious to the PHOSITA to add to the combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker to give an award matched to said profile being valued at less than or equivalent to said profile valuation only, for the above stated goal. Giving more would be inconsistent with Boushy’s goal of giving “commensurate awards” (col. 14 lines 22-24).

Claim 5:

Art Unit: 3688

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claim 1 above and BOUSHY further discloses customer's preferences are collected (col. 9 lines 54).

But neither BOUSHY nor PEIRCE explicitly disclose wherein said matching includes considering award preferences of said patron or plurality of patrons. However since one usually is more receptive to offers that one likes, it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to add to BOUSHY an offer based on the consumer preferences to increase the odds that the offer would be accepted. These personalized awards would enhance the customer's overall experience with the business and the awards process and might make him or her more likely to return, a goal of Boushy (col. 10 lines 49-53).

Claim 6:

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method as in Claim 5 above and BOUSHY further discloses wherein said matching further includes considering current conditions (col. 13 lines 29-32). (Note "current conditions" also reads on current activities of the customers, which as stated in discussions of previous claims above, determine level of awards as points and/or comps).

Claim 7:

The combination of BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claim 5 above of matching awards based on customers preferences and further BOUSHY discloses the system monitors customers reactions to offers (redemptions) for analysis to better target subsequent offers (col.14 lines 43-49 and lines 58-60). Since one is more likely to accept an offer that one likes, accepting a particular award is some indication of one's preference for that award. Thus at col.14 lines 43-49 and lines 58-60, BOUSHY discloses matching awards wherein "the award preferences are based at least in part upon reaction of said first patron to other awards previously offered to said first patron".

Claims 27 and 29:

The combination of Boushy in view of PEIRCE and Walker discloses a method and/or system as in claims 1, or 24 above. BOUSHY in view of PEIRCE does not, but Walker discloses wherein said server logic is further designed or configured to generate a script containing information that describes how to deliver said first award to said first patron and wherein said logic is further configured to output said script to the display device (e.g. [0076]; [0168]: "prompts" reads on scripts) .

Thus it would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to add such functionality to the system of Boushy and PEIRCE to help the representatives make effective offers presentations as taught by Walker.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 21-29 have been carefully considered but are not persuasive. Arguments as to Pierce are addressed at page 7. No further arguments are made as to Boushy and Walker.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh H. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-6721. The Examiner works a part-time schedule and can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday 9:00-6:00. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Robert A. Weinhardt can be reached on 571-272-6633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3600. For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314). Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Khanh H. Le/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

December 2, 2009